DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 452 584 EA 030 932

AUTHOR Bogotch, Ira
TITLE Reconceptualizing the Principalship (as a Profession): dot.com.
PUB DATE 2000-11-00
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration (Albuquerque, NM, November, 2000).
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; *Administrator Effectiveness; Administrator Evaluation; Educational Principles; Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Leadership; Leadership; Leadership Qualities; *Leadership Responsibility; *Leadership Training; *Principals; *Professional Development
IDENTIFIERS Florida Atlantic University; *University Council for Educational Administration

ABSTRACT

This essay argues in favor of extending the social construction of the role of the principal to include dot.com values and experiences, while being alert to identifying those values and experiences that are potentially educative. The premise is that the practical lived experiences of educators, particularly school administrators, are too narrow for professionalization as practiced outside schools. Therefore, what is recommended is a broader perspective of educational leadership as a field that encompasses new roles for principals, superintendents, professors, and policymakers, along with a concurrent shift in change and implementation strategies derived from policymaking to an innovative redevelopment strategy derived from pedagogy. (Contains 16 references.)(Author/TEJ)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 452 584

Reconceptualizing the Principalship [as a profession]:dot.com
Paper presented at the annual conference of UCEA, November, 2000 in Albuquerque

by Ira Bogotch, Florida Atlantic University

Abstract
In this essay, I argue in favor of extending the social reconstruction of the role of the principal to include dot.com values and experiences – while being alert to identifying those values and experiences which are potentially educative. The premise is that the practical lived experiences of educators, in particular school administrators, are too narrow for professionalization as practiced outside of schools. Therefore, what is recommended is a broader perspective of educational leadership as a field that encompasses new roles for principals, superintendents, professors, and policymakers, along with a concurrent shift in change and implementation strategies derived from policymaking to an innovative re-development strategy derived from pedagogy.

Preface
The underlying assumption of this essay is that managerial responsibilities [and its requisite set of knowledge, skills, and values] have historically dominated the role the principal.[1] It has withstood and resisted the research community's efforts to reform; thus, to borrow from the title of the UCEA symposium, it doesn't take a masters degree [specifically a degree in educational leadership] to hold the position of school principal as it is currently conceived.

My approach deliberately shifts the focus of conversation away from the so-called "real world" of school leadership as shaped by the institutional and local contexts inside of schools toward today's truly unique social, political, and economic dynamics in a dot.com environment. As we are said to be in the midst of a severe principalship [and teacher] shortage (Steinberg, September 3, 2000), with increasing competition to attract talented individuals into education, the structural, contextual, and cultural differences between the field of education and other professionals in our society are striking, perhaps as never before. In very broad strokes, large segments of the professional social classes are moving toward wireless technology, flexi-time, multi-job lifestyles [characteristic perhaps of many of us here today], and, in growing numbers, the accumulation of wealth. In contrast, our public school colleagues have just suffered through another decade of missed economic opportunities, where their salaries and pensions have not kept pace with the economic gains made by the other professions; where instead of the freedom offered by wireless technology, our school administrators are wired and tethered to beepers and cellular phones inside a closed, zero-tolerance [in terms of leaving the school building] 24-7-365 job for life (see Table 2). Even when some schools and school administrators are said to have all

---

[1]There are two points relevant to this discussion: (1) regardless of how we reconceptualize the principalship, the managerial role will remain integral (Bogotch, 1992; Cuban, 1988); and (2) regardless of what role has predominated the principalship, there have always been individuals who have served their schools with distinction while others have served by mistake.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
I Bogotch
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 030936

the bells and whistles, their media uses do not reflect the capacity and pace of the outside world, but instead remain cluttered with tired routines, trite pronouncements and burdensome requests. In education, the medium has not transformed the message.

In concert with our public school systems, educational leadership professors are now called upon to do our share – in a hurry [can you say "fasttrack"?]– and replenish the depleted administrative pools. With whom? The message we are given is all too clear: give us candidates who look and can act like the leaders we [already] have [i.e., us]. Hence, the future seems so predictable, so much like the past. What will it take to break this isomorphic paralysis so that we may professionalize not in the next five years, but overnight into the role of the principal working in a dot.com world?

Methods, if you can call them that:

The approach here is different from the traditional ways educational researchers, such as myself, have been studying the principalship: that is, it relies more on non-educational sources, external observations, imagination, and creating new images, rather than on careful empirical analysis of existing contexts, roles and structures of schools. It looks for new directions outside the institutional contexts of schooling. While I recognize that at the level on which my ideas are presented, there is no chance that this approach will bring about any real change in the role of the principalship. That is, it is not enough to reconceptualize the principalship intellectually, especially by focusing solely on so-called "distal variables" (Wang, Haertel, & Walberg, 1993). Nevertheless, such an exercise is anything but "practically useless" (Elmore, 1993, p. 314). Quite the contrary, educational leadership needs a foreign policy agenda. For close to a hundred years, the role of the principal has been domesticated in spite of the best efforts of educational reformers and researchers to redirect the focus of the principalship away from its institutionalized managerial status. The traditional paths of reform from idea inception to reform implementation or from backward mapping have been inadequate. We need an infusion of new new realities, ones which intentionally disrupt the "real world" variables of institutionalism, incremental change and program implementation. There is enough historical evidence, for me, to conclude that change is not just a matter of will or of doing better quantitative or qualitative research – we need to reconceptualize educational leadership culturally if we hope to change not only the role of the principal, but the field of educational leadership as well. What drives my search away from traditional methods is that schools as they are currently structured are not as educational as they need to be. Too many adults and children inside of schools are not learning, and if they are learning, they are not as joyful about it to ensure that their learning will become a lifelong habit. In other words, schools and education need to be improved across the board. We must use the tools of our trade [traditional educational research], along with new tools, to keep up the struggle. For me, this also calls for a break with tradition, not forever, but for a symposium of time.

Unlike my understanding of school systems and schools which are based on in my professional experiences and expert knowledge as an educational researcher, my understanding of the disruptive technologies or dot.com values and experiences is grounded in my observations of the postmodern conditions shaping the social, political, and economic dynamics of 21st century America and the global economy. My viewpoints on the reconceptualization of the school

principal, therefore, come not as an expert, but rather as a member of society who would like to see public schools improve. How we connect in theory and practice the internal structures and dynamics within schools with the broader socio-cultural dynamics occurring around the globe will determine the unforeseeable and impossible [to predict] possibilities for reconceptualizing educational leadership.

So where do these contrary observations lead? What will it take to reconceptualize, not the fantasy of the school leadership, but rather a different reality of school leadership?

An arguable conceptual framework

Schools offer a very narrow range of experiences, educative as well as non-educative, to both the adults and children on the inside. To a large extent, this delimited reality has been a deliberate, if not artificial, construction. It is how we have purposefully designed the organizational structures, curricula and teaching methods and materials. We've invented developmental concepts of readiness and appropriateness and have built structures and methods around these concepts. As problems arise in practice and implementation, we then have manipulated aspects of these concepts called variables up or down, more or less – adjusting the knobs and amounts in search of better results. It was/is a reasonable approach, and it was/is continuously justified by those in authority.

Actually, the structures, curricula, methods and materials [along with the research] no longer need any serious justifications, for they have been accepted culturally by society as well as school practitioners. Parents and teachers demand their presence. There has been a century long conditioning process in which success inside of schools [and the academy] requires practitioners to learn how to conform and adapt to the structures, curricula and methods. As for those insiders, adults and children, who have not adapted successfully, they either leave/dropout [e.g., Jonathan Kozol, the teacher becomes an independent writer/critic; Neil Postman, the teacher turns toward the field of cultural studies] or are made miserable [e.g., fill in the name of a school friend here]. Why is it that measures of teacher and principal satisfaction usually receive a rating of "moderately satisfied"? Is that the best we have achieved under institutionalized conditions? That ought not be good enough for education.

Social Reconstruction

Dewey and his disciple-reformers throughout the last hundred years have had other ideas about the potential of schooling. Dewey's own idea was to bring more practical experiences into schools. By practical he meant the lived experiences of the grownups and children in schools. It would be out of these shared social experiences that a new, more relevant and exciting kind of learning would evolve. Schools would not be so much about conformity and adaptation as they would be about a social reconstruction of knowledge and the solution of relevant social problems. Under the traditional system which dominates schooling, we place adults and children into an already given and prescribed situation and tell them to study, learn, and behave. Researchers then have observed the phenomena and described the different kinds of reactions to these dynamics. Over time, we have become accustomed to associating and attributing certain responses to specific groups of people. Under schooling conditions, we observe that some people succeed and others do not. The abiding assumption becomes that some people can be taught and

can learn while others can not. Educational researchers then suggest alternative settings, new methods, and different dynamics in order to improve/increase the learning of all. Sometimes these suggestions, if put into practice, work and sometimes they do not. What doesn't really change are the governing assumptions, the narrow teaching and learning experiences, and the prescribing of "more or less" [e.g., more hours, more tests, fewer interruptions]. In other words, we have yet to open up schools to a broader societal, if not global, range of experiences in order to re-invent teaching, learning, and leading under these more diverse, multidimensional situations. We have yet to challenge and disrupt our schooling assumptions under different sets of social conditions and experiences.

To initiate this experiment, it is not sufficient to rely just upon the practical experiences of teachers, administrators and children. We have to introduce new and different experiences into our schools – experiences which challenge the conclusions reached from educational researchers who have supported the teaching and learning concepts such as readiness and appropriateness and leadership concepts such as incrementalism and implementation (Table 1). Dewey offered two suggestions: one, educators need "to understand public opinion and the social order" (1909, p.x), and two, educators need to work out the "how" of teaching, learning, and leading as a reconstructive, social process, rather than as a practice of conformity and adaptation to a given standard. Dewey believed that it was possible for education to be a continuous growth experience which would lead to meaningful social changes, and not inevitably a closed system of cultural reproduction (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1996).

Table 1: Educational Contexts

Institutional Contexts
- Policymakers
- Parents
- Educators themselves

Organizational-Cognitive Concepts
- Readiness
- Appropriateness
- Developmental
- Rational
- Chronological Order

Incremental Processes
- Slow evolution
- Piece-meal change

Implementation
- Top Down
- Procedural
- Routinized
- Distrust

In defining educators as professionals, Dewey stated that the issue of professionalism in education is different from that of any other field [of study or practice]. Because of the public nature of education, the general public has an explicit right to participate in shaping the purposes and directions that schools should take in America. At the same time, educators need to be able to articulate their domain[s] of knowledge and skills which separate their work as professionals from that of the public. Here Dewey attempted to draw a line between the shared task domain of determining the "what" of education and professional's specific knowledge and skills needed in delineating and practicing the "how" of education. Although Dewey refers to the "how" in terms of "the details," we should understand that he is not trivializing the role of educators to matters of technical proficiency and managerial tasks alone; rather, it is out of the details which make up everyday lived experiences that Dewey reconstructs knowledge and morality underlying public education. That's quite a leap to make, and even many scholars who align themselves with Dewey, such as Nel Noddings, Jerome Kohlberg, and Lee Shulman, can't quite accept Dewey's argument[s] as a complete or sufficient answer.

I, too, agree with Dewey's critics, but along a different line – one more consistent with Dewey's own social reconstructive philosophy. That is, educators, specifically educational leaders, need to reach out to public discourses which are potentially educative. There's no set criteria for how to do this. Within everyday situations, however, there are opportunities to engage grownup and children in discourses, including activities, which spark an imaginative idea, depict an aesthetic scene, or share a personal aspect of one's self. To borrow from a Kozol title, educational leaders need to give voice and meaning to "ordinary resurrections." Such actions and reconstructive criteria certainly differ from the more explicit criteria and developmental demands made by Noddings (1998) and Kohlberg (1972) respectively. It is towards identifying educative potentials that I now turn.

The arguable conceptual framework I offer embraces the dynamics surrounding the dot.com, postmodern, global conditions which are changing the rules of thinking, speaking, relating, and acting. Rather than remaining inside the current mindset, where principaling is conceived of as a craft somewhere along the continuum between instructional leader and manager, we need to open the box to professionalism and allow for unpredictable models of leadership and learning. One should not interpret my suggestions, however, as ignoring or putting down school and school system contexts while extolling dot.com [especially its connections to business and money] thinking exclusively. An understanding of both "what is" and "what might be" will be needed in order to one day soon see this reconceptualization in actual practice. Moreover, an understanding of school system and school contexts is necessary in order to devise specific short term strategies for how to educationally introduce new dot.com ideas. In my own empirical research, I have identified some of the creative, joyous, and pedagogical variables found inside the processes of development which contrast starkly with the mindless, routine and distrusted procedures of implementation (Bogotch, 2000). Such a distinction holds out the promise of reform through pedagogy, not through policy – a theme I will return to at the end of this essay. At this time, I want to add an additional variable of resistance located in ourselves; it is a self-directed prejudice within the educational community that has assumed that schools should be conceived of only in limited and limiting terms, and that ideas relevant to a *summa cum laude* Princeton graduate [e.g., CEO of Amazon dot.com] are not directly relevant to K-12 education.

Such an anti-intellectual prejudice, debilitates education twice: once for working with the limited practical experiences of adults and children within schools, and again for not being capable of incorporating radical and intellectual ideas into K-12 education.

Introducing Socio-Cultural Dynamics: Global/Postmodern Conditions

Outside the limited experiences and closed knowledge systems of schooling lies an unpredictable and uncertain future– a future, however, which is not completely unknown. In fact, it is a future that has been constructed and reconstructed over time, again and again. Only recently, however, has it become more noticeable, if not an attractive alternative phenomena. It emerges out of a human need for discovering "new" and different ideas rather than in following safer already troddened paths. Much of what is "new" is referred to as dot.com or popular culture, where entertainment, glamour, wealth, and adventure are valued as quality of life indicators, where a person's lifework turns on how close it is to her heart rather than how close [the school-building] is to her home. Passion matters. The words "calling," "passion," and "heart" have been mythologized as part of the educators' litany. It may be time to explode that myth. But the real challenge lies, I believe, in identifying the educative potentials inside of dot.com culture – that is, identifying and separating educative from non-educative in the larger socio-cultural world we live in.

In education, the starting point for connecting school life with life itself – even when the latter seems dominated by such false gods as anti-intellectualism, consumerism and materialism (Postman, 1995) is Dewey. Education alone may not be able to reform society, but to ignore popular culture is to ensure its continuing influence and dominant role in reconstructing society – beyond its borders. The dot.com world is only one sector of society, based on a limited technical and market-oriented knowledge. Its value-orientation, however, is much more far-reaching. Dot.com culture reflects values based on capacity and a new way of thinking and acting across traditional borders. It dictates a new kind of thinking – an intellectual who can expropriate ideas from different specialized fields of study into creative combinations and under new conditions. It is about redefining both values and worth as well as legitimate measures of growth. Ironically, schools have always been affected by changing cultural dynamics. Schools which are labeled as "excellent" take advantage of their "value-addedness." As Meyer and Rowan (1977) pointed out almost thirty years ago, if you can connect with the larger social institutional environment, there is a logic of confidence and professional trust that need not be closely supervised or even measured. Conversely, low performing schools that are unable to trade on their values, are measured and remeasured, and must suffer policy makers, however well-intentioned, who enjoy and enhance their own status and privilege by mandating change.

Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) are convinced that even the relative autonomy of schools in society masks its mirroring and reinforcing of the hierarchies of social classes autonomy of schools; and, they make a strong theoretical argument. But I think that times have changed, along with technologies, and that our unique American history is very different from the French social and educational systems. As a nation, we have contributed more to the emergence of postmodern/global conditions [not philosophy] than any other country over the past few decades. These factors have contributed to a convergence of socio, political and economic conditions which surround our schools, but have remained outside of them. Our public schools seem

trapped inside a perpetuating reality in which K-12 educators ignore, deny, and refuse to participate actively in the socio-cultural dynamics all around us. Even if such actions were not deliberate, the result would be the same: as our society undergoes radical transformations of questioning old ways of thinking, speaking, relating and acting, our public schools continue to lose their legitimacy as a vital social institution, threatening to become almost invisible to all our citizens, rich, poor, and those in the middle. Public education is endangered conceptually and materially. It will take more than traditional educational reforms neatly packaged in understandable and incremental chunks to revitalize them.

In the next section, I have outlined a number of postmodern conditions, followed by very brief descriptions to illustrate some departures in thinking, speaking, relating and acting from traditional cultural norms, especially those structural norms found inside schools. In this realm, I have no professional credentials to rely upon; I only report what I see around me when I leave schools.

Postmodern Conditions:

The following dot.com themes do not address educational leadership or leadership as a topic directly. They tell us nothing about the role and responsibilities of public school principals. Rather, they are about the social dynamics and changes in values, thinking, relations, and acting of participants under conditions which may be viewed as postmodern in that they do not seem to have evolved rationally from past events or practices. In some respects, the new thinking and acting represent a radical break from the past; but then again, they may not. In every instance, the dot.com culture has emerged unpredictably and in contradiction to many of the cultural beliefs about the way things work. I offer a few of these themes in order to demonstrate potential rethinking of educational leadership and to redirect the conversation of the principalship and professionalism towards developing new research hypotheses and change strategies, and away from the questions of whether a principal can be a professional if she doesn't wear the right clothes or speak the right words with the correct inflections. In school districts, we have separated administrators from teachers by contract, schedule, salary, and dress and have used these surface structures to define professionalism (Table 2). I think professionalism in education means something different – as yet only partially articulated.

Table 2

Distinct Professional Contexts: Surface Structures

Inside of School	Outside of School
Jacket & Tie/Heels & Hose	**Dressy Casual**
Fulfilling Security Needs	**Potential for Wealth**
Wired & Tethered	**Wireless**
24-7-365	**Flexi-Time**
Vested Job for Life	**Multi-Career**

1. Considering Value and Worth as Measures of Growth: Over the past few years, there has been a dramatic reversal from the strict reliance upon the rational analyses of growth, a trend which closely corresponds to the emergence of enormous wealth. In observing this trend, we should note how economic wealth (a) has preceded actual balance sheet profits, (b) has not followed foundational logic such as reducing debt or adhering to historical price-earnings ratios, or © allowed failure to effect optimism (Silver, November, 2000). The attraction of value concepts and worth within specific sectors seem to defy not only rational analysis, but also generalized knowledge. At the same time, there is no shortage of rational analyses or faith in conclusions as evidenced by the persistent publishing of indices, trends, balance sheets and other data to measure growth.

In education, we seem to be following just the opposite trend, one that places greater reliance placed upon rational data and data analysis while ignoring values and concepts of worth. When we ask along with Fullan and Hargreaves (1991/1996), what's worth fighting for, we should include what people outside of education at every social strata are valuing and how they are judging worth. This is not a prescription to follow the bulls or the bears or popular culture fads, but rather to understand how thinking and actions are changing based on what people value most. In a dot.com world, meanings are in flux, made operational by results. When we study these operations, we may discover that some of the "new" behaviors may be original, really new, i.e., without any precedents or history. Or, we may discover that some of the "new" behaviors are not new at all – only that we are noticing them because of their dramatic economic, political and social consequences – for the first time.

2. Chronology? Chronology is one of many different organizational perspectives. Daniel Zalewshi in an essay on culture titled, "Out of order"(September, 1998), compared two museum showings one in which the pictures were presented in chronological order, the

other in a thematic order of life and work. He and others have begun to ask, "what does this willingness to break with tradition and change in chronological order signal? Chronology is a conceptual device that functions much like a metaphor. We use chronology to aid in remembering and connecting. In challenging chronology, the mind may be stretched in new ways in order to remember and connect with different ideas.

As a framework, chronology serves as a plan, offering starting, mid and end points as the parameters. It establishes a linear path, helping us to return back to issues and then to reshuffle according to issues. In the dot.com world, there has been a dramatic reversal of some lifelong [and "career"] chronologies, namely with respect to academic credentials and philanthropy. For generations, professionalism has been characterized by increased academic credentials. For example, administrative certification went from one or two courses to more than ten courses. In medicine and law, years of schools and interning have been added to the professional curricula. Dewey noted that this trend distinguished professionals from non-professionals as early as 1904. While we see it continuing in educational leadership, it is no longer as dominant a trend in society today – but not for reasons we give in education such as alternative certification.

Many of today's best and brightest have delayed their educations in order to follow their ideas into practice. They want to see whether their ideas can work better than what currently is [working]. Regardless of success, however, it is only after such an adventure that some decide to return to formal schooling for the credential, but clearly in a different social status [and perhaps different tax bracket].

Similarly, with respect to philanthropy, the notion of setting up a foundation to distribute monies for social, political and educational purposes are no longer limited to late stages of life. Young men and women are giving away portions of their wealth to support research and causes of their choosing. The changes seen in the stages of life evidenced by the giving away of money indicates that sequences and chronologies are not fixed. We have always known this, but our research pursuit of developmental stages, rational orders, and the subsequent building of structures around these constructions have put children and grownups into a lockstep chronology based more on past practices and tradition than on Dewey's notions of growth as lifelong education.

3. Outside and Alongside the System: While there have always been outlaws and rebels who for artistic reasons needed to escape the dominant [oppressive] structures of school systems, corporate America, or the Hollywood Studios, there are increasing numbers of individuals who in seeking entrepreneurial freedom have begun to create alternative structures through which they compete and distribute their own ideas and products. New, alternative avenues and networks are being discovered everyday by these pioneers. For example, if the established record label won't allow the artist to say the words she has written, or they propose a limited distribution plan, then the recording artist will create her own independent operation for development and distribution – not as the exception any longer, but rather as the rule.

These successful forays, however, are not limited to artists and performers. Alternative or complementary approaches are emerging inside the traditional professions as well. Health care and complementary medicine are good examples. Here, we are witnessing how professional lives are capable of imitating art. Why not education? Do the words "maverick" and "troublemaker" ascribed to principals and teachers tell a different story?

At what point, however, does today's entrepreneur become tomorrow's monopolist? And once entrenched as the dominant force in the market, what incentive is there to keep investing in new ideas? Some may extol the values of competition, but is not competition a process that results in the creation of monopoly? Competition weeds out the "weak" leaving fewer competitors. Why then should we look to educational competition as a reform strategy? The movement toward monopoly and increased size (e.g., Microsoft) stifles competition, but continues to develop and re-develop, again and again, new and creative ideas. Monopoly and size have much different images when appended to public education. Why?

4. Developing and Re-Developing, Again and Again: In order to be a high performing organization and stay on top, organizations must continue to develop and redevelop new products and ideas. They have to allocate sufficient resources to R&D operations – even if it means reducing the organization size by fifty percent. In education, neither R&D nor restaffing have been fully supported. Instead, we continually rely upon an outmoded system: development first and implementation second as the dominant method of reform. Given our past experiences along this track, failure is predictable. That is, educators are deeply cynical about rules which specify how to implement someone else's ideas. In contrast, by engaging in continuous re-development we may potentially re-capture the joy of teaching, learning, and leading (for a more in-depth discussion on this distinction see Bogotch, 2000).

5. Free Agency: In sports, the term for freedom is called "free agency." Today, professional athletes change teams even before their employment contracts expire. In the business world, headhunters are used to hire [read steal] top performers. Thus, in so many non-public school environments, the meanings of commitment and loyalty as organizational values are being challenged and reconstructed – which raises questions that go to the very essence of developing professional values. As a result, new organizational strategies have to be devised in order to keep talented individuals and successful teams intact and even then, there can be no guarantees. Job security has been exchanged for freedom, vision, and passion. At the same time, discussions of incentives, merit, benefits, and work conditions are still relevant. G.M. and Chrysler provide their workers with aol.com for three dollars a month. How can we do less for educators? The significant difference between education and outside of education is that in education, the career discussion is a one-time, life-time decision without freedom. On the outside, the life/work choices are being revisited and revised [if not always rewarded] continuously along the way.

6. Discourses: If one listens, it is apparent that today's discourse is more informal, if not uncivil. Parental advisories are everywhere. And for many, including educators and parents, the discourse is worrisome. A State Department of Education can mandate that children call their teachers "Sir" and "Mame," as in Louisiana, but for some, "that sucks." For others, the reaction is "whatever." Still for others, the changes occurring in language, tone, and words represent a more honest and brutal truth, one heretofore not spoken, heard or written. Is this to be welcomed? We are certainly testing the limits of free speech and, at times, transgressing the previously drawn lines. Do we protect children with V chips or the embarrassing details of the Starr Report? Our children hear, absorb, sing, spew foul language,... but, the inputs are never one way; there is a, constant, competing struggle of ideas and words – many coming out of the next philanthropic group to emerge in society: the undereducated athlete as role model – individuals who potentially may do more good for inner cities than all the Head Start programs and Boys Clubs combined. During all this time in education, we continue to talk the talk, speaking in platitudes and jargon.

> "It's very easy nowadays to fall into a kind of knee-jerk jargon.... We *do* want our administrators to be efficient. God knows we can't afford to waste a cent in these days of high accountability, and I applaud those who can run a tight ship. But when they can't get through a sentence without `accountability' or `benchmarks' or `competencies' or `performance-referenced standards,' then it's time to get down and pray for some tactical guidance from the god of vigorous verbs and honest nouns. I do think [such] language can deaden our souls ..." (Kozol, November, 2000, p. 21).

Alongside of new discourses are new communications networks. Technology allows people to communicate with others whom they may never meet or see except virtually. To some extent this crosses the borders of nationality, race, gender, etc., traditional barriers of knowledge and experiences. In education, we limit communications inside of schools and school districts. We communicate on a "need to know" basis, maintaining strict control over our borders. And as noted previously, we clutter the channels of new communications technology with the same routine PA-style announcements, rather than allowing that technology to help us transform our social interactions and the messages therein.

Table 3: Distinct Professional Contexts II: Deep Structures

Postmodern Conditions	Modern Conditions
Value and Worth with Growth	**Fundamentals: Measures of Growth**
Asynchronistic & Metaphorical	**Chronological & Linear**
Entrepreneurial Rebel	**Vested and Organizational**
Free Agency?	**Loyalty to whom?**
Re-Developing Again & Again	**Develop & Implement**
Discourses: Brash & Trash/Honest	**Talk the Talk, Walk the Walk/Forked Tongue**

Connecting Postmodern Themes with Educational Leadership Pedagogy

Even if only one or two of the above postmodern, new, new things, survives to be introduced into our schools, there would be no going back to the old ways of thinking and acting. Just as America will not rebuild a manufacturing economy, people who have "been there and done that" are now moving on to new territories. These new knowledges, new values and social dynamics are all potential catalysts of change – tempting us with alternative hypothesis for researching and teaching leadership.

While the educational establishment has ignored or denied the dramatic social and economic changes, today's youth come to school with different values, different concepts, different chronologies, different languages, and different feelings of human relationships at all stages of developing – and which need to be sorted out and reconstructed educationally and morally. How should we respond? We can wait for educators as citizens and individuals to see these changes and to respond inside of school systems, but that is not likely to reform education. Certainly that won't do for at-risk students and burnt-out administrators! Rather, it is up to the field of educational leadership – as a broad coalition of universities, professional associations, and school practitioners – to encourage educators to become more involved in these social, political, and economic dynamics, to become involved with our children in a different dynamic. Right now, schools reflect the reality described by Bourdieu and Passeron – poor children enter and exit poor, without acquiring the human capital needed to learn and grow. Schools reinscribe the current social class hierarchy.

As I see it, we can sit back, debate the "real world" constraints to instructional leadership versus management, and let the new emerging groups and professional classes lay out the future of education in this country. They have the power to buy access to any legislator or executive [or to buy their very own elections, viz. Senator Corzine, 2000] and put forth a educational reform

proposal which we affect all of us for generations. They may already possess the power to dismantle public education with the same focused aggressiveness seen in board rooms throughout the country. Their dot.com lives are filled with meanings, values, and purpose, many of which are potentially educative, and many which are not. It is our responsibility – as professionals in educational leadership – to identify new new ideas, expressed in a more honest and educative discourse, and communicated as lessons to be learned [rather than as policy directives]. As soon as we realize this responsibility [and borrow their discourse], we will be in a stronger position to attract the dollars being made in the new economy, – and without those dollars and dot.com ideas, public education has always had to do more with less. Why should public education turn its back on either the new, new ideas or the new economy? Is there some transcendental moral principle prohibiting our lack of attention? [This is where I hear a teenage voice: Hell-O!].

The agenda, as I see it, is for the profession of educational leadership, including professional associations and university professors of educational leadership – to study and re-introduce postmodern social, political and economic themes into the curriculum for both teachers and aspiring administrators. And if we cannot do this by ourselves, invite others to help us. The six disruptive technologies, described above, are not only potential hypotheses for research and practice, but also topics for leadership lesson planning. For example, the fluidity of measures of growth, values, and worth may be incorporated into redesigning a school's vision; the break in chronology may free us from the cages of developmentalism and incrementalism; entrepreneurism may propel schools to individualize and personalize their purposes, curriculum , methods and materials; free agency may re-position loyalty [away from an individual or system in terms of cya] and encourage professional values and creative incentives; re-developing may help the educator within all of us to rediscovery the joys of learning and teaching; while honest talk may bring administrators, teachers, students, and parents back into the conversation and let us regain our self-respect. As leadership lesson plans to be taught and learned we can hopefully rediscover values and worth derived from pedagogy, not policy. That is, as both educational leadership professors (outside-in) and principals (inside-out) learn about the external, dot.com social dynamics, they assume the responsibility to teach themselves, others, teachers, students, and communities. In so doing, they continue their own professional development as educational leaders, not as managers. Professors and principals could teach new ways of thinking, the new concepts which comprise the new new realities. The goal could be to embrace, work with, and learn from these postmodern disruptions, not ignore them. For too long, educational leadership has settled for making things work, getting the jobs done and not addressing the educational knowledge base inside of the pedagogy of educational leadership. Each of the above themes, and many others, are being concretely experienced, publicly demanded, and reported on daily in the dot.com news. The evidence is right there for us [educational leadership professors] to study and learn from and then share this new knowledge and skills with our school leadership colleagues. It is up to educational leadership as a dynamic and emerging field to bring today's realities [as distinct from the trap of "real world" discourse currently dominating the language of educational leadership], not as economic incentive variables, but rather as a paradigm shift-metaphor for another multiple intelligence – to take *these already existing realities and help society inside and out of schools to interpret postmodern, dot.com lessons educationally and morally.* It is in the detailed "how" of education, namely through teaching and learning, not through the discourses

of policymaking, management, or structural-functionalism that this change will occur. For me, that is a worthwhile reconception of the role of the principal by reconceptualizing the collaborative work of others in the field of educational leadership.

References:

Bogotch, I. (April, 2000). Reclaiming pedagogy in ISLLC Standards for Educational Leaders. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of America Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA

Bogotch, I. (1992)."Managerial virtues of necessity and choice," In. P. First (Ed.). Educational Policy for school Administrators (pp. 260-266). Boston: Allyn & Bacon

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.C. (1977/1996). Reproduction in Education, Society & Culture. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cuban, L. (1988). The managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in schools. Albany: SUNY Press

Dewey, J. (1909). Moral Principles in education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Elmore, R. (1993). What knowledge base? Review of Educational Research, 63(3), pp. 314-318.

Fullan, M., & Hargreaves, A. (1991/1996). What's worth fighting for in your school? New York: Teachers College Press

Kohlberg, L. (November, 1972). Moral development and the new social studies. Speech presented at the National Council for the Social Studies, Boston MA. ERIC document ED073022

Kozol, J. (November, 2000). A conversation with Kozol [with Paul Houston]. In The school administrator, pp.16-21).

Meyer, J. & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutional organizations: Formal structure as a myth and ceremony. American Journal of Sociology, 83(2), 340-363.

Nodding, N. (1998). "Thoughts on John Dewey's 'Ethical Principles underlying Education'" The Elementary School Journal, 98(5), 479-488.

Postman, N. (1995). The End of Education. New York: Vintage Books

Silver, V. (November 17, 2000). Big losses, but bigger smile. Sun-Sentinel, Business Section D, pp.1-2)

Steinberg, J. (September 3, 2000). Nation's schools struggling to find enough principals. New York Times (pp. 1, 24).

Wang, M., Haertel, G. & Walberg, H. (1993). Toward a knowledge base for school learning. Review of Educational Research, 63(3), 249-295.

Zalewshi, D. (September 13, 1998). "Out of order" New York Times Magazine. (pp. 38ff.)